SECTION III—REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 13, 2003, which office action the Examiner made final. No claims are amended herein, and claims 1-45 remain pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Allowed Claims

The Examiner indicated that claims 18-28 were allowed. None of these claims is amended herein, so they continue to be allowed.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 10-13 and 38-41 for being dependent on rejected base claims, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if amended to include the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. In view of the remarks below, Applicants submit that the base claims are allowable, and that the Examiner's objections are thus overcome. Applicants therefore respectfully decline to amend these claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 14-16, 29-32 and 42-44 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,236,735 to Bjorner et al ("Bjorner"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element, as set forth in the claim, is found in a single prior-art reference. MPEP § 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As further explained below, Bjorner cannot anticipate these claims because it does not disclose every element and limitation recited therein.

Bjorner discloses a two-camera system for locating and storing indicia on conveyed items. As shown in Figure 1, the system includes a conveyor 12 that first moves a parcel 14 through the field of view of a low resolution CCD camera 16 and then through the field of view of a high-resolution CCD camera 22. The low resolution camera 16 is a low resolution, monochrome, 256 pixel line-scan type camera (col. 7, lines 3-6), while the high resolution

camera 22 is a monochrome, pixel line-scan type camera (col. 7, lines 20-23). A belt encoder 26 provides a signal indicating the speed of the conveyor 12 to a video processor 28 and to the high resolution camera 22. The belt encoder 26 is a standard belt driven opto-mechanical encoder (col. 8, lines 1-4). As shown in Figure 4, the belt encoder 26 supplies a signal indicating the speed of the conveyor 12 to the video processor 28 and the high resolution camera 22, while the video processor 28 provides a power supply 44 and a line clock signal 45 to the low resolution camera 16. Cycles of the low resolution camera 16 (*i.e.*, exposures of the line of CCD pixels comprising the low resolution camera 16) are triggered by line clock signal 45. Each cycle captures a row of the image of the surface of a parcel 14 as it moves past the low resolution camera 16. A black/white video signal 54 is transmitted from the video processor 28 to the host computer 30 where it is initially captured, one line at a time, in a 256 by one-bit FIFO low resolution line buffer 56 (col. 10, lines 1-3, 5-9). In this manner, the one-dimensional line images captured by the low-resolution camera 16 are assembled by the host computer 30 into two-dimensional images (col. 9, lines 40-42).

The high-resolution camera 22 functions in much the same way as the low-resolution camera 16. The high resolution camera 22 provides a line clock signal 62, a pixel clock signal 64, and a grey-scale video signal 66 to the host computer; the line clock signal 62 and the pixel clock signal 64 for the high resolution camera 22 are analogous to the line clock signal 45 and the pixel clock signal 46 for the low resolution camera 16 (col. 11, lines 14-20). The video signal 54 is transmitted from the high resolution camera 22 to the host computer 30 where it is initially captured, one line at a time, in a line buffer 68. The host computer 30 sequentially reads the high resolution buffer 68, extracts data that is within the region of interest 40, and creates and stores a two-dimensional image of the region of interest 40 in the general purpose memory 58 of the host computer 30 (col. 11, lines 29-32, 35-40). As with the low-resolution camera 16, then, the one-dimensional line images captured by the high-resolution camera 22 are assembled by the host computer 30 into two-dimensional images (col. 9, lines 40-42).

Claim 1 recites a method combination including, among other things, "capturing multiple images of at least a portion of a surface of the component in response to the trigger signal, the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image." Bjorner does not disclose, teach or suggest a method including such a limitation. As discussed above, Bjorner teaches that the cameras capturing the images should be line-scan cameras. Line-scan cameras capture one-dimensional images, not two-dimensional images. Bjorner therefore cannot teach a method including "capturing multiple images," "the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image." Applicants thus submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 1 because it does not teach the capture of two-dimensional images, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 2-4, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 2-4 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 1 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Claim 14 recites an apparatus combination including, among other things, "an image sensor configured to capture multiple images of at least a portion of a surface of a component in response to a trigger signal in an automated identification system, the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image." As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Bjorner discloses only the capture of one-dimensional images and therefore does not disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus combination including the recited limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 14, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Regarding claim 15-16, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 14 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 15-16 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 14, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Claim 29 recites a method combination including, among other things, "capturing multiple two-dimensional images of at least a portion of a surface of the component in response to the trigger signal, the multiple two-dimensional images comprising a series of images including a first image and at least one subsequent image." As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Bjorner teaches only the capture of one-dimensional images and therefore does not disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus combination including the recited limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 29, and respectfully request allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 30-32, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 29 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 30-32 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 29, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of the claims.

Claim 42 recites an apparatus combination including, among other things, "an image sensor configured to capture multiple two-dimensional images of at least a portion of a surface of a component in response to a trigger signal in an automated identification system, the multiple two-dimensional images comprising a series of images including a first image and at least one subsequent image." As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Bjorner discloses only the capture of one-dimensional images and therefore does not disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus combination including the recited limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 42, and respectfully request allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 43-44, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 42 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 43-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 42, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 5-9 and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious in view of, and therefore unpatentable over, Bjorner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,770,841 to Moed et al ("Moed"). In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 17 and 45 under § 103 (a) as obvious in view of, and therefore unpatentable over, Bjorner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,773,808 to Laser ("Laser").

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claims 1, 14, 29 and 42 are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 5-9 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 1, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein; claim 17 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on allowable claim 14, as well as by virtue of the features recited therein; claims 33-37 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 29, as well as by virtue of the elements recited therein; and claim 45 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 42, as well as by virtue of the elements recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Conclusion

None of the references singly or in any motivated combination disclose, teach, or suggest what is recited in the independent claims. Thus, in view of the above remarks, all independent claims are now in condition for allowance. The dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims are likewise allowable based on at least the same reasons and based on the recitations contained in each dependent claim.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 292-8600.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10-10-03

Todd M. Becker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,487

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030
Phone: 206-292-8600
Facsimile: 206-292-8606

Enclosures: Postcard